

## REMARKS

Claims 1, 4, 11, 12, 15, 20 and 28 are pending the application; Claims 1, 4, 11, 12, 15, 20 and 28 stand rejected. By this Amendment, Claims 1, 12 and 28 have been cancelled, Claims 4, 11, 15 and 20 have been amended. These amendments add no new matter to the application.

Claims 1, 4, 11, 12, 15, 20 and 28 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph as allegedly not enabled. However the Examiner has expressly indicated that the claims are enabled for “a method of inhibiting beta-amyloid protein fibril formation by administration of laminin or polypeptides specifically recited in Claim 15.” The Examiner’s concern appears to be with non-elected species present in some of the claims, and with such claim elements as, “fragments thereof” and the like. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections, but in the interest of a early arrival at a definition of allowable subject matter, has cancelled claims 1, 12 and 28 without prejudice and amended the remaining claims to be drawn only to elected species SEQ ID NO: 3, and to remove other recited elements. Accordingly, all remaining claims are believed to be enabled, and are therefore allowable; Applicant requests reconsideration and early favorable action.

Claims 1, 4, 11, 12, 15, 20 and 28 also stand rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph as allegedly indefinite. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections as well. Applicant submits that the terms reducing and inhibiting have more or less accepted and well understood meanings in the art, as attested to at least in part by the number of issued claims Applicant has already received that contain these terms in comparable context settings. They are indeed relative terms, but no comparison term is commonly needed, as the terms are addressed to any degree of reduction or inhibition, as discussed in part in the examples. Applicant in fact claims any degree of inhibition of amyloid fibril formation in environments such as those claimed.

Applicant also submits there are no missing structural cooperative relationships in the claims; those skilled in the art well understand the relationship between the presence of beta-amyloid protein and the normal (uninhibited) formation of beta-amyloid protein fibrils (also

sometimes referred to as amyloid fibrils). Such a relationship is also discussed in detail in the specification and therefore requires no elaboration or even recitation in the claims themselves, according to long-standing claim drafting practices.

Claim 4 is not indefinite in reciting a synthesized polypeptide; Applicant submits that not all effective polypeptides are synthesized, as for instance is claimed in Claim 11. That is, some claimed polypeptides may be cleaved or otherwise taken from naturally occurring laminin chains. Claim 4 serves the imminently permissible purpose of claim differentiation.

Claims 11 and 20 introduce and recite "A chain" laminins; there is no antecedent required as these elements are first introduced in the respective claims. In order to help clarify this, each occurrence of the laminin A chain element has been amended to be preceded by the indefinite article "a".

Applicant believes that it has responded fully to all of the concerns expressed by the Examiner in the Office Action, and respectfully requests that early favorable action be taken on all claims pending in the application. Applicant respectfully requests reexamination of all rejected claims and early favorable action on them as well. If the Examiner has any further concerns, Applicant requests a call to Patrick Dwyer at (206) 343-7074.

Respectfully submitted,



PATRICK MICHAEL DWYER  
Reg. No. 32,411

P03-OA4.RSP

PROTEOTECH, INC  
1818 WESTLAKE AVENUE N, SUITE 114  
SEATTLE, WA 98109